

*Total of

PTO/\$B/33 (07/05) Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to	a collection of in	formation unless it d	isplays a valid OMB control number.
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		ITO.0045US (P16093)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the	Application Number		Filed
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR	10/634,130		August 4, 2003
on May 4, 2007	First Named Inventor		
Signature May Lia Mayder	Brian G. Johnson		
	Art Unit Examiner		
Typed or printed name Cynthia L. Hayden	28	318	Thao P. Le
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the			
applicant/inventor.			gnature
assignee of record of the entire interest.			
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) Typed or printed name attorney or agent of record.			
			printed name
Registration number 28-994	(713) 468-8880		
		Teleph	one number
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.			
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		Ma	y 4, 2007 Date
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Tradeamrk Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

_ forms are submitted.



In re Applicant:

Brian G. Johnson et al.

Art Unit: 2818

Serial No.:

10/634,130

Examiner:

Thao P. Le

Filed:

August 4, 2003

Docket:

\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$

ITO.0045US

P16093

For:

Multilayered Phase

Change Memory

Assignee:

Intel Corporation

Mail Stop **AF**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

The rejection is premised on the improbable proposition that a rationale to modify a reference which does not teach the claimed invention could be supplied by a second reference which also teaches away in the same way as the first reference. In other words, two references that teach not doing what is claimed are somehow combined to teach what is claimed. It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

Khouri, like Parkinson and Lowrey, all teach using programmable phase change memory elements that change between amorphous and crystalline phases. Khouri, in particular, suggests that better current flow can be obtained in the crystalline phase. But he explicitly teaches that the way the memory works is to reversibly switch between crystalline and amorphous phases. See paragraphs 5, 8, 13, and 14, as examples. Thus, Khouri, like all of the other cited references, does not teach a substantially crystalline, non-switching ovonic material. Instead, he teaches a

Date of Deposit: <u>May 4, 2007</u>

I hereby serlify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.D. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Cynthia L. Hayden

conventional ovonic material that switches between amorphous and crystalline phases. The fact that he mentions that there is less resistance in the crystalline phase is noted, but the rationale to modify goes against the very teaching of Khouri himself. If it was so good to stay in the crystalline phase, why did Khouri not stay in the crystalline phase? The answer is that he saw no reason to do so. And this is the fundamental defect in the rejection. It combines two references that saw no reason to do what is claimed and attempts to add them together and come up with something different than their sum. This is impermissible and logically and legally untenable.

The problem Khouri would see is why would I want to make a memory cell which only conducts? Then it could not store any information. He would have no reason to believe that it would be good to make a cell which includes a non-changing memory element. The claim requires a combination of a substantially crystalline, non-switching ovonic material and a switching phase change material. No such structure is suggested. The fact that Parkinson or anyone else suggested a non-switching amorphous material does not tell how or why to make a non-switching, crystalline material.

Therefore, the rejection should be reconsidered.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 4, 2007

Timothy N Trop, Reg. No. 28,994 TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750 Houston, TX 77057-2631

713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation